

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANIBAL RODRIGUEZ, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
GOOGLE LLC,  
Defendant.

Case No. [20-cv-04688-RS](#) (AGT)

**DISCOVERY ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 264

1. Google need not produce “all Documents related to the Pr\*\*\* Na\*\*\* project.” Dkt. 264-3 at 4. Pr\*\*\* Na\*\*\* was “Google’s mid-2020 effort to reevaluate and improve its privacy offerings companywide,” across “an ecosystem of ~70 services.” Dkt. 264 at 2, 5 (simplified). The project was “not focused on WAA, nor was WAA a critical or substantial piece of the project.” *Id.* at 5. Google has produced final and draft versions of the Pr\*\*\* Na\*\*\* report and has committed to “searching its collection of custodial files for documents with the terms of ‘Pr\*\*\*Na\*\*\*’ or ‘Pr\*\*\* Na\*\*\*.’” *Id.* Plaintiffs want Google to go beyond the 24 agreed-upon custodians and conduct a comprehensive search for information about the Pr\*\*\* Na\*\*\* project. Dkt. 264 at 5. But given the project’s scope and the fact that WAA wasn’t a substantial part of it, plaintiffs’ request is overbroad and is denied.

2. Google need not produce “all Documents relating to any Google job performance reviews (including without limitation any self evaluations) for each of the 24 Google document custodians.” Dkt. 264-3 at 3. The Court agrees with Google that this request is overbroad because Google’s custodians’ performance reviews are not directly relevant to the issues being litigated.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: January 13, 2023



ALEX G. TSE  
United States Magistrate Judge